Attorney Docket No.: 018765-9001

## REMARKS

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 6, 7, and 13-15 would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, upon entry of this Response to Office Action, Claims 1-19 are pending in the Pending Application.

## A. Summary of Examiner Interview

The undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for participating in an Examiner Interview on May 3, 2006 and preparing the Interview Summary mailed on May 8, 2006. As stated in the Interview Summary, the Examiner has acknowledged that US Published Patent Application US2002/0003645 A1 ("Kim"), which was cited in the Office Action, does not teach "a first transmission support having a first end connected to the interface unit input and at least a second end connected to the interface unit output," as recited in Claim 1. The Examiner has also stated that upon the submission of a response to the Office Action, he would consider the argument presented during the Examiner Interview.

## В. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-12 and 16-19 under 35 USC 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9-12 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by US Published Patent Application US2002/0003645 A1 ("Kim").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference." MPEP § 2131; Verdegall Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of anticipation because he has failed to show that Kim teaches all the limitations of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-12 and 16-19. The Examiner has acknowledged in the Interview Summary that Kim fails to teach a first transmission support having a first end connected to the interface unit input and at least a second end connected to the interface unit output as recited in Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-12 and 16-19.

Attorney Docket No.: 018765-9001

Kim discloses a mobile communication network including optical filters (OL1-Oln) that connect a plurality of compact base transceiver systems (BTS1-BTSn) to a compact base transceiver system controller 18. [Kim, pg. 1, para. 11; para 13; Fig. 2]. Each of the optical filters (OL1-OLn) includes one end connected to the compact base transceiver system controller 18 and a second end that terminates at the last (BTSn) of a plurality of series-connected compact base transceiver systems (BTS1-BTSn) [Kim, Fig. 2]. As a result, the second end of each of the optical filters (OL1-Oln) does not connect to the compact base transceiver system controller 18 at all. Therefore, as admitted by the Examiner in the Interview Summary, Kim fails to teach a first transmission support having a first end connected to the interface unit input and at least a second end connected to the interface unit output. Thus, Kim fails to teach all the limitations of

PAGE 5/6 \* RCVD AT 6/8/2006 5:57:54 PM [Eastern Davlight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/8 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID:3122220818 \* DURATION (mm-ss):02-42

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

MICHAEL BEST FRIEDRICH 2008/006

'06/08/2006 17:01 FAX 3122220818

Attorney Docket No.: 018765-9001

## Conclusion

In light of the acknowledgement made by the Examiner during the Examiner interview and in the Interview Summary, we believe that the additional arguments presented in the Amendment and Response to Office Action filed November 14, 2005 appear to be moot. Therefore, these additional arguments will not be repeated in this Response to Final Office Action.

Further, in view of the remarks set forth in this Amendment and Response to Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that the Pending Application, including Claims 1-19, is in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the foregoing remarks be entered and the Pending Application be promptly allowed.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if such contact would in any way facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2006

Susan D. Reinecke, Reg. No. 40,198 Lisa C. Childs, Reg. No. 39,937 Michael Best & Friedrich LLP 401 North Michigan Avenue Suite 1900

Chicago, Illinois 60611 (312) 222-0800